DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 133 030 JC 770 071

AUTHOR McCain, J. Charles
TITLE Resource Development Programs in Two-Year Colleges: A National Survey. A Report to the National Council for Resource Development.
INSTITUTION National Council for Resource Development, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jan 75
NOTE 8p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Alumni; Community Colleges; *Educational Finance; Federal Aid; *Financial Support; Foundation Programs; *Junior Colleges; *National Surveys; Private Colleges; *Private Financial Support; Trend Analysis

ABSTRACT

A national survey of more than 1,100 two-year colleges was conducted to determine current trends in obtaining outside financial support. Areas focused on were financial resource development methods, staff organization and administrative support for development, and resource development efforts. A response rate of 73% was achieved. Results indicated: (1) 64.1% of the two-year colleges were engaged in some form of resource development; (2) approximately half of the colleges did not devote a full-time position to the development effort; (3) private schools utilized more personnel in development than did public schools; (4) nearly one-third of the colleges with development programs received endowments; (5) multi-campus colleges emphasized development more than single-campus colleges; (6) alumni programs were in the greatest need of development/improvement; and (7) federal grants contributed to public two-year college development more than any other source, while in the private sector, federal grants were surpassed by gifts from individuals, alumni, trustees, and churches. (JDS)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED133030

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS IN TWO-YEAR COLLEGES: A NATIONAL SURVEY

A

REPORT

TO

The National Council For Resource Development

by

J. CHARLES MCCAIN

JANUARY, 1975

JC 770 071

Introduction

It was the purpose of this study to determine through a national survey of two-year colleges the current trends in obtaining financial support. The results of such a study may be used as a basis for developing financial resources in two-year colleges.

The National Council for Resource Development provided the structure for obtaining current data on the trends of financial resource development in two-year colleges. The support of such a study by the council was supportive to the stated objectives of the organization.

More than 1,100 two-year colleges were included in the survey to determine (1) the current trends of financial resources; (2) the methods that were utilized by various institutions to solicit financial support; (3) staff organization and administrative support utilized in developing financial resources; and (4) a brief description of the institution that described its resource development effort or lack of effort.

The report is an excerpt of the dissertation, Resource Development Programs In Two-Year Colleges: A National Survey, which evolved from the study. The survey yielded a return from 803 or 73 percent of the colleges included in the study.

Discussion

The survey was distributed through the ten regions of the United States on the basis of the geographical grouping by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Each region submitted more than 67 percent of its questionnaires, which gave a representative return for a comparison of resource development programs among these ten regions.

An analysis of the findings indicated that 64.1 percent of the

two-year colleges were engaged in an identifiable form of resource development. The development programs were staffed part-time by 17.1 percent of the colleges which means that approximately 50 percent of the colleges did not devote a full-time position to this effort. Private schools devoted an average of 1.69 persons per college to the resource development program, whereas the public sector had an average of 1.01 persons for this purpose.

More than 44 percent of the respondents replied that foundations were the source that was in greatest need of development. Only 15.5 percent of the colleges indicated the need to cultivate federal sources.

It was found in this study that 31.7 percent of the two-year colleges with development programs had received endowments, and only 18.8 percent of the colleges without development programs received endowments. The establishment of a resource development program reportedly contributed significantly to the financial resources of 177 (34.4 percent) of the responding institutions. The development programs were found to be well supported by 72.2 percent of the colleges that had such programs.

It was established by this study that multi-campus colleges gave more emphasis to the resource development concept than do single campus institutions. Only 56.7 percent of the single campus colleges had a resource development program, but 84.3 percent of the multi-campus colleges had developed the concept. The development program was further enhanced by a larger student enrollment, since only 64.3 percent of the colleges with enrollments below 1,000 had development programs and 91.6 percent of the colleges with enrollments above 20,000 had development programs.

A further analysis of the findings consistently showed that

the resource development officer was responsible administratively to the president, but as the college increased in its enrollment, there was a tendency toward decreasing this officer's direct responsibility to the president.

Colleges with a state office to assist in the resource development function were more likely to have development programs. Where there was no state office to assist in this function, the percentage of college participation decreased. In several states there was a state coordinating board responsible for development programs in two-year institutions throughout the state. This type of centralized effort negated the necessity of developing expertise on each campus. The resource development concept was increased through a centralized state level effort, but local initiative was also important.

One of the least developed resources was the alumni fund, and there was no indication that two-year college development officers considered this to be an area needing development in the future. It was found in this study that 13.5 percent of the respondents had an annual alumni program. Of the 112 colleges which had a program for this resource, 42.9 percent was private colleges. The smaller colleges gave more emphasis to alumni resources than did larger colleges. As two-year college enrollments increased, the frequency of alumni programs decreased.

It was concluded that two-year colleges had discovered that federal grants contributed more to their resource development programs than any other single resource. An exception would be the private sector, which received a larger percentage of support from other sources such as individuals, including alumni and trustees, and churches. The private sector listed federal grants as the second most productive

resource. Public colleges considered state grants as the second most productive source of development funds. Smaller colleges were less productive with federal grants than larger colleges. There was a trend for the percentage of federal funds to increase in the development program as the enrollment increased.

Two scarcely used development techniques were professional fund-raisers and consultants. The use of professional fund-raisers by two-year colleges was reported by only 10 respondents who happened to be from private colleges with enrollments below 1,000. Consultants were used by approximately 31.3 percent of the colleges that had full-time development programs.

Conclusions

Findings within the limitations of this study appear to justify the following conslusions:

1. Approximately 50 percent of the two-year institutions had a full-time staff for resource development. The resource development concept was evident in the private sector more than in the public sector, at multi-campus colleges than at single campus colleges, and at colleges that had help from a state department officer than colleges that did not have such assistance. As the student enrollment increased, there was an increase in the development program staff. Also, states that did not have laws which impeded the resource development program had a larger percentage of college development programs.
2. Two-year colleges received more resource development support from federal grants than from any other single source. The

second most productive source was state grants. The source considered to need the most cultivation was the private foundation segment.

3. Alumni fund development, fund-raising techniques, and the use of consultants received minimal utilization. Alumni funds were more broadly developed by private colleges and by those with an enrollment below 1,000.
4. Colleges that had resource development programs supported the concept of development. The greatest needs were for additional personnel to staff existing programs and for the initiation of programs where no programs were in existence.
5. The development officer had the primary responsibility for preparing grant proposals, although a variety of combinations existed. The preparationof proposals was usually a team effort, which began with the person who identified the problem.
6. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges and the National Council for Resource Development were the two most helpful organizations for resource development officers. The Federal Register was the single most helpful source of information.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are made as a result of the major findings and conclusions of this study:

1. An office at the state department level could investigate the possibility of cultivating diverse financial resources for two-year colleges. In cases where there is no development

officer on the local campus, this function could be accomplished at the state level or with consortia of two-year colleges. The responsibility for training a staff and providing information about resource development at state and local levels might be handled through the state office.

2. The National Council for Resource Development could give consideration to local and state workshops to assist in the implementation of resource development programs in two-year colleges.

3. Federal agencies could consider providing a time-table which would allow adequate leeway for the development of proposals at the local level. The administrators who work in the agencies in Washington could plan to be more accessible in the states and regions to share concepts of their programs.

4. The award of grants to colleges for categorical assistance might be best placed at a state and/or regional level. This arrangement would make information and personnel more accessible. The decisions on resource allocation could be better accepted, given the personal involvement of local personnel.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

FEB 25 1977

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES